



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,993	08/27/2003	David J. Schneider	P755-2/HSCH 2 00007	4365
27885	7590	04/09/2008		
FAY SHARPE LLP				
1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SEVENTH FLOOR				
CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
EXAMINER				
ANDERSON, JAMES D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/09/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,993

Applicant(s)

SCHNEIDER, DAVID J.

Examiner

JAMES D. ANDERSON

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 43-51 are presented for examination

Applicants' amendment filed 2/4/2008 has been received and entered into the application. Accordingly, claims 34-42 have been cancelled.

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/4/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant presents the following arguments traversing the statutory double patenting rejections of claims 43-51 over USP Nos. 6,749,804 and 6,616,892.

Applicant argues that identical subject matter is not present in the claims under examination and claims 1-16 and 26-39 of USP No. 6,749,804 and claims 1-12 and 20-30 of USP No. 6,616,892. Applicant asserts that one can apply trichloromelamine such that it affects the production of ammonia and odors without applying so much that the pH of the habitat is lowered to less than 5 as recited in instant claim 43. This is not persuasive because Applicant in the 6,749,804 and 6,616,892 patents teaches that application of TCM in accordance with those inventions "has indirect insecticide properties" in that "by lowering the pH" the life cycle of certain insects is interrupted (*e.g.*, col. 5, lines 8-10 of the '892 patent and col. 5, lines 24-26 of the '804 patent). In other words, according to Applicant "...by the application of TCM to a

Art Unit: 1614

habitat the pH is lowered to less than 5" (col. 5, lines 11-12 of '892 patent and col. 5, lines 27-28 of the '804 patent). As such, it is clear that the lowering of pH to less than 5 is a direct result of applying TCM to an animal habitat that is not distinguishable from the ammonia reducing and odor reducing properties of TCM. Further, it is noted that the concentrations of TCM applied in claims 9-12 and 33-35 of the '804 patent are identical to those recited in instant claims 49-51. It is not clear to the Examiner how the same concentrations of TCM can be applied to the same animal habitat and yet have patentably different effects as asserted by Applicant.

Accordingly, in the absence of a showing that TCM can be applied to an animal habitat in an amount that reduces the production of ammonia and odors without lowering the pH of the habitat to less than 5, the rejections are maintained for the reasons of record and as reiterated below.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

U.S. Patent No. 6,749,804

Claims 43-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-16 and 26-39 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,749,804. This is a double patenting rejection.

The instant claims recite a method of “controlling Darkling beetles” comprising treating an animal habitat with trichloromelamine *such that* the pH of the habitat is lowered to less than 5. The claims of the ‘804 patent recite methods of reducing the production of ammonia and odors in an animal habitat and “sanitizing” an animal habitat comprising applying an *effective* amount of trichloromelamine. The method steps of the pending claims and the claims of the ‘804 patent are identical. For example, both sets of claims recite treatment prior to the placement of animals in the habitat, treatment after placement of animals in the habitat, treatment prior to and after placing animals in the habitat, dusting and soaking the animal habitat, and concentrations of from about 25 ppm to about 1000 ppm. As such, the results of such treatment will be the same and are inseparable with respect to patentability.

As there is no evidence of record that applying trichloromelamine to an animal habitat in the amounts claimed in the ‘804 patent (which are the same as those instantly claimed) will not result in a lowering of pH and control of insects, the instant claims claim the same invention as that claimed in the ‘804 patent. In fact, at column 5, lines 24-31 of the ‘804 patent, it is disclosed that application of TCM **in accordance with this invention** has “indirect insecticide properties”. Accordingly, the Terminal Disclaimer filed 3/16/2007 cannot be used to overcome this rejection.

U.S. Patent No. 6,616,892

Claims 43-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-12 and 20-30 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,616,892. This is a double patenting rejection.

The instant claims recite a method of “controlling Darkling beetles” comprising treating an animal habitat with trichloromelamine *such that* the pH of the habitat is lowered to less than

5. The claims of the '892 patent recite methods of reducing the production of ammonia and odors in an animal habitat (claims 1-12) and "sanitizing" an animal habitat (claims 20-30) comprising applying an *effective* amount of trichloromelamine. The method steps of the pending claims and the claims of the '892 patent are identical. For example, both sets of claims recite treatment prior to the placement of animals in the habitat, treatment after placement of animals in the habitat, treatment prior to and after placing animals in the habitat, dusting and soaking the animal habitat. An effective amount as recited in the '892 patent appears to be a 100 ppm solution of TCM sprayed on an animal habitat (col. 5, lines 55-56). As such, the results of such treatment will be the same and are inseparable with respect to patentability.

As there is no evidence of record that applying trichloromelamine to an animal habitat in "an effective amount" as claimed in the '892 will not result in a lowering of pH and control of Darkling beetles, the instant claims claim the same invention as that claimed in the '892 patent. In fact, at column 5, lines 8-13 of the '892 patent, it is disclosed that application of TCM **in accordance with this invention** has "indirect insecticide properties". Accordingly, the Terminal Disclaimer filed 3/16/2007 cannot be used to overcome this rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES D. ANDERSON whose telephone number is (571)272-9038. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI 9:00 am - 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James D Anderson/

/Ardin Marschel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614

